



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,515	06/01/2001	Wolfgang Otter	7781.0029-00	1508

22852 7590 04/14/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/872,515	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OTTER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Nathan Hillery	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 12/15/04.
2. Claims 1 – 15 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8 and 10 are independent.
3. The objection to the Specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 1 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turpin et al. (US 5745712 A) and further in view of Emmet et al. (US 20020129006 A1).
3. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Turpin et al. teach that *in a preferred embodiment, value trees select a conclusion based on the first condition that is satisfied (although this preference may be modified to suit the needs a particular embodiment). For simplicity to the user, however, the conditions are typically positioned in the order that they should be evaluated. In the preceding example, for instance, the condition >20 should be the first condition in the value tree* (Column 24, lines 9 – 17) as illustrated in Figs 36A-B, which provide for **providing a logic view with nodes to represent the layout items, wherein the logic view displays a processing order of the layout**

*items defined by the position of the nodes*, that as shown in FIG. 37D, the value tree now shows a branch 631, but no condition or conclusion. A dotted rectangle surrounds the conclusion node, showing that it is selected (Column 24, lines 59 – 61), which provide that it **displays at least one of the nodes as a selected node to represent a selected layout item**; that thus, the properties of objects may be visually manipulated. Properties are also conveniently inspected. Properties of a field can be inspected, for instance, by clicking on it with the right mouse button (Column 22, lines 31 – 34), which provide for **providing a property view to display properties of the selected layout item**; that FIG. 15 illustrates the ability of the system of the invention to highlight the selected path in a tree for the user (Column 17, lines 1 – 2), which provide for **providing a layout view to display the layout items, wherein the selected layout item is highlighted**; that in the Form Tool, lets the user select multiple objects in order to perform editing operations, assign or revise properties, or reposition the selected fields as a group of objects (Column 6, lines 38 – 41), which provide for **modifying the selected layout item and the processing order through interaction with a user**; **and** that FIG. 4 represents the major divisions of the "form image data file" which is generated during form creation.. (Column 12, lines 63 – 64), which provide for **creating a form definition document**. Turpin et al. do not explicitly teach **visualizing structure information of the form**; however, Emmet et al. teach that *in this regard*, pursuant to an example embodiment of the present invention, the application server provides the user at the client personal computer with visual representation of the document with identifiable tags or labels. These visual tags or labels are provided to facilitate user

*modification of the underlying tree data structure of the document as formatted for a large form factor display. The user then modifies the tree data structure by, for example, deleting entries, moving entries, and changing labels assigned to various nodes of the data structure to form a modified data structure. This modified data structure is then later used by the application server to reformat the associated document for display at a small form factor display of a client (Block 0018), which provide that **the logic view displays labels associated with the nodes to visualize structure information of the form**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Turpin et al. with that of Emmet et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Turpin et al. with a system and method for presenting content developed for display on large form factor devices (e.g., PC monitors) on small form factor screens of handheld devices (Block 0013).*

4. **Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3**, Turpin et al. teach that *both trees are made of nodes. There are branch nodes (restricted and unrestricted) and conclusion nodes. A restricted branch is simply a branch that is associated with a field; an unrestricted branch is not limited to values in a field. An empty node serves as a placeholder, indicating the absence of a tree or the lack of a conclusion after a branch. Every node has a condition except the root branch (the first branch). In a preferred embodiment, a decision is made by reading trees from top to bottom and left to right. Thus, trees are read in much the same way one would read a flow chart: Is Quantity (branch) greater than 25 (condition)? If the answer is yes, then Shipping Method is*

*Commercial carrier. If the answer is no, then evaluate the next condition (Column 22, lines 44 – 56), which provide that **providing the logic view as a tree view and wherein the nodes are tree nodes so that the processing order is visualized by a root node, a plurality of branch nodes, and a plurality of leave nodes** (conclusion nodes), and that **the plurality of branch nodes comprise condition nodes to process layout items depending on logical statements in the nodes.***

5. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Turpin et al. teach that *in the Form Tool, lets the user select multiple objects in order to perform editing operations, assign or revise properties, or reposition the selected fields as a group of objects (Column 6, lines 38 – 41), which provide for **wherein modifying the processing order through interaction comprises changing the position of the tree nodes.***

6. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Turpin et al. teach that *notwithstanding, disclosure of the invention in this particular environment, the principles of the invention can be implemented as a program which includes an integral interface facility; or in the context of other interface environments (Column 11, lines 18 – 22), which provide that **the steps providing logic view, providing the property view and providing the layout view are performed for a graphical user interface on a single screen.***

7. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Turpin et al. teach that *in accordance with the invention, keyboard entries are checked against "field characteristics" which are assigned to a field during form creation. If a keyboard entry for a field is not consistent with the assigned characteristic, the entered value is rejected and an error message advises the operator of a problem. Such characteristics can be assigned to a field by*

*standard "picture" specifications. Alternatively, requirements for the form of a field input can be established by local form rules which are implemented by decision trees attached to the field. As an option, upon the occurrence of an error in input format, the field in error can be cleared and the prompt returned to that field to continue form completion (Column 4, lines 30 – 41), which provide that the **step modifying comprises verifying the compatibility of the layout items and the processing order with a predefined data interface of the business application.***

8. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Turpin et al. teach that *an event tree for a form can initiate actions when a form is opened or closed. For example, a form event tree could have Close as a condition, and @PRINTFORM(FormName) as the conclusion. Every time a user closes that form, it would be printed. A form event tree could have Open as a condition, and @FIELDFIND(FieldName) as a conclusion. In this instance, every time a user opens that form, the specified field would be selected (Column 29, lines 47 – 54), which provide for **further comprising generating a form printing program from the form definition document, wherein the form printing program being called by the business application to print a final document.***

9. **Regarding independent claim 8**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claims 1 – 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

10. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

11. **Regarding independent claim 10**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

12. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

13. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

14. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

15. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the



shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NH

  
**JOSEPH FEILD**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**